

Date: Thu, 13 Jan 94 06:11:53 PST
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #32
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Thu, 13 Jan 94 Volume 94 : Issue 32

Today's Topics:

- *WANTED-> Kenwood SM220 station monitor
- An online repeater database
- cancer from ham radio
- DIPOLES FED BY LADDER LINE - Q
- Fm Broadcast
- Fm Broadcast (Legal Part 15 power levels)
- Packet-Internet gateways
- Portable 2m Antenna for Mountaineering???
- Ramsey kits not too good
- Ramsey Kits Revisited
- Signaling Device Wanted
- Vaccuum Tubes, Lots of them!
- Vintage 50's station for sale
- WANTED: 1930's Vacuum Tubes for display
- WANTED: Info on Standard C5718DA (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Wed, 12 Jan 1994 01:22:30 GMT
From: cs.yale.edu!csusys.ctstateu.edu!white@yale.arpa
Subject: *WANTED-> Kenwood SM220 station monitor
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Looking for a Kenwood SM-220 station monitor.....
Replies to WHITE@CSUSYS.CTSTATEU.EDU
73 de N1QVE

Harry

Date: 12 Jan 94 12:48:29
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!msuinfo!
netnews.upenn.edu!mipg.upenn.edu!yee@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: An online repeater database
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Can someone copy this file to an anonymous FTP site? My mailer won't let me copy it, its too big.

Greg
WA9EYY

I'll take care of it since it was originally posted by me.
Tentatively it will be at mipg.upenn.edu I'll post the details as soon as I get my sys admin to take care of it.

--
Medical Image Processing Group | Conway Yee, N2JWQ
411 Blockley Hall | EMAIL : yee@mipg.upenn.edu
418 Service Drive | VOICE : 1 (215) 662-6780
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6021 (USA) | FAX : 1 (215) 898-9145

--
Medical Image Processing Group | Conway Yee, N2JWQ
411 Blockley Hall | EMAIL : yee@mipg.upenn.edu
418 Service Drive | VOICE : 1 (215) 662-6780
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6021 (USA) | FAX : 1 (215) 898-9145

Date: 13 Jan 94 06:20:38 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!news-feed-2.peachnet.edu!umn.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!
taaron@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: cancer from ham radio
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Tell me, if ham radio causes cancer, why is it that all the ham radio club meetings are filled with old people with few health problems other than normal ones for their age?

Travis Wise
KB8FOU
18 yrs old
General class

--

Travis A. Wise
1421 Grace Avenue
San Jose, CA 95125-5206
taaron@netcom.com

KB8FOU
Senior, Del Mar High School
(408) 383-8570

Date: 12 Jan 94 20:32:43 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!srigenprp!alanb@hplabs.hp.com
Subject: DIPOLES FED BY LADDER LINE - Q
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

MAYNARD@URIACC.URI.EDU (MAYNARD@URIACC.URI.EDU) wrote:

: I just bought an antenna tuner and want to put up a dipole fed
: by 450 ohm ladder line, for use across 160-10 meters. The longest
: one I have located commercially is one 135ft long with 100ft of
: feed line, for 80-10 meters (much cheaper, incidently, than building
: from scratch with current wire prices!). Anyone have an opinion
: on my going to ~260 ft (yes, I do have room), especially regarding
: performance on higher bands (40-10 meters).

The 260-foot antenna would work better on 160 meters. You could probably load up the 135-foot antenna on 160, but efficiency might be poor because of the low radiation resistance.

On the higher bands, the main difference with the 260-foot antenna would be the radiation pattern. On 80 meters, the pattern would be a cloverleaf (maximums at approx. 45-degree angle from the wire) instead of bi-directional perpendicular to the wire. On 40-10 meters, the antenna would tend to be more directional off the ends of the wire than with the 135-foot antenna.

AL N1AL

Date: 12 Jan 94 12:16:39 EST
From: world!ksr!jfw@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Fm Broadcast
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

alanb@sr.hp.com (Alan Bloom) writes:
>chris andersen (akcs.marz@vpnet.chi.il.us) wrote:
>: Is it possible for a person with ham or modified ham set up to broadcast
>: on the 88-108 Mhz area???

>None of the other respondents mentioned that it is perfectly legal to
>broadcast on the FM broadcast band using very low power. You can
>buy "wireless microphones" and other devices with a range of a couple
>hundred feet or so.

True, but normally those "wireless microphones" aren't described as "ham or
modified ham set ups" (though there are people who have converted 49MHz
walkie-talkies to 6 meters...).

Date: 12 Jan 94 20:27:54 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!srngenprp!alanb@hplabs.hp.com
Subject: Fm Broadcast (Legal Part 15 power levels)
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Barry x24904/ER/167B-TED (ornitz@kodak.rdc.s.kodak.com) wrote:
: In article <2gv1l8\$4jrn@ep130.wg2.waii.com> mjg@ep130.wg2.waii.com
: (Michael Gentle) writes:
: >IF you use less than 100mw and
: >a antenna for less than 5' in length then I beleive that it is legal.

: Fellow hams...
: PLEASE stop propagating these myths.

: The Part 15 rules give the maximum permissible field strength at a specified
: distance from the antenna. For transmissions in the FM broadcast band, the
: numbers are 250 microvolts per meter measured at three meters.

: Many commercial wireless microphones and FM home-broadcaster kits far exceed
: these power levels and are illegal to use by FCC rules.

I haven't looked at the part 15 rules in years, but unless they have
changed, you are allowed to use EITHER the field strength limit OR the
power and antenna length limit.

AL N1AL

Date: Wed, 12 Jan 1994 00:27:40 GMT
From: amd!amdahl!netcomsv!netcom.com!wy1z@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Packet-Internet gateways
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I have finally completed my collection of packet <-> internet gateways.
I have placed the information on world.std.com in
pub/hamradio/packet-internet

If anyone has any updated information, please e-mail me.

The information included is for the following gateways:

amprnet (miscellaneous Amateur tcp/ip gateways)
ka2qhd
n0ary
n6qmy
w2xo
wb7tpy

73 and enjoy!
Scott

--

```
=====
| Scott Ehrlich      Internet: wy1z@neu.edu      BITNET: wy1z@NUHUB  |
| Amateur Radio: wy1z      AX.25: wy1z@k1ugm.ma.usa.na      |
|-----|
| Maintainer of the Boston Amateur Radio Club hamradio FTP area on      |
| the World - world.std.com  pub/hamradio      |
|-----|
=====
```

Date: 12 Jan 1994 17:03:00 GMT
From: korie!newscast.West.Sun.COM!abyss.West.Sun.COM!sunspot!myers@ames.arpa
Subject: Portable 2m Antenna for Mountaineering???
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Jan12.092451.1134@titan.ksc.nasa.gov>

Nguyent@snowmass.ksc.nasa.gov (Tom) writes:

>David,

>

>Try a rolled up J-pole. It's made of 300 Ohm Twin lead and tapped with a
>50 Ohm coax with BNC connector on opposite end. It provides about 2.8dB
>gain. You can buy the ant from MFJ for about \$12 or build it yourself.

Since a J-pole is an end-fed 1/2 wave vertical, how does it have
2.8 dB of gain? 2.8dB of gain in relation to what? A quarter-wave?
A dipole? An isotropic radiator?

Optimally, a J-pole will have 0 dB relative to a 1/2 wave dipole,

but the matching section contributes loss, so I'd normally expect a J-pole to provide a little less than 0dB, say -.5dB relative to a dipole. If so, this is something like 1.5dB over an isotropic radiator...

--

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD 466 | Views expressed here are *
* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily *
* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer *
* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: Tue, 11 Jan 1994 23:23:57 GMT
From: mulvey!rich@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Ramsey kits not too good
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Steve Bunis SE Southwest Chicago (doc@webrider.central.sun.com) wrote:

: Just to mix up the pot abit more - Just talked with a local ham
: who bought and put together the Ramsey 2 meter amplifier kit. He
: was on the air with it last night and sounded very good. I asked
: him if he had run into any problems with construction, design etc.
: and he claimed it came up and worked the first time. He was very
: happy with it. His total cost (kit + case & misc.) came to just
: under \$50.

: Now I understand that this design is much less complex than building
: a transceiver, but it sounds like you need to pick and choose which
: kits to buy, and which to avoid.

Ask him again after he puts it on a spectrum analyzer.

- Rich

--

Rich Mulvey Amateur Radio: N2VDS Rochester, NY
rich@mulvey.com "Full power on half a watt."

Date: 12 Jan 94 15:50:23 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!
moe.ksu.ksu.edu!cbr600@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Ramsey Kits Revisited
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Posted for a friend w/out net access:

He's building a Ramsey FX440 kit, and having problems with the transmit. It appears to receive fine, but according to him, something is wrong with the transmit buffer. I'm not very knowledgeable about the internal workings of a radio (yet), but any help from anyone working on or has built one of these would be greatly appreciated. Reply via e-mail to me (until the 14th) or to steve@matt.ksu.ksu.edu (after that). Thanks for any help!

Jeremy Utley

PS... If you end up mailing to the second address, put on the first line:
For: Van Zander

Thanks again!

```
-----  
Jeremy L. Utley          | jlu@cis.ksu.edu  
Computing & Infomation Sciences | cbr600@ksu.ksu.edu  
Student                  | cbr600@ksuvm.bitnet  
Kansas State University  | bxth85a (Prodigy)  
A.S. Comp. Sci. & Acctg.   | NOYAX@N00ER.#NEKS.KS.USA.NA (Packet Radio)  
-----
```

```
-----  
Date: 13 Jan 1994 11:07:33 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!garnet.berkeley.edu!ep208@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Signaling Device Wanted  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu
```

My wife, daughter, and myself have carried pagers for over 10 years. They are very useful for keeping in touch. Recently we have become frustrated by the inability to find a public phone which is working, not limited to outgoing calls, and not in use by a drug dealer. It seems well less than half of the phones are available. Also, my wife drives about 45 minutes to and from her office and we would like to be in touch with her during that time.

Since we have HAM licences, at HT for each person seems like a good possibility. Some sort of digital squelch could be used. But they both feel the HT is too big and heavy. I have pushed for that solution for years. I have also suggested our own patch to the phone line and our own phone-answering machine in the loop.

Pocket portable phones seem a possibility, but the cost nears \$100 a month for each if you consider connect charges, instrument cost, and instrument protection from theft.

We have developed a series of codes which work fine for us. 1 means "Everything is fine, I am where I should be, and on schedule." 1514 means "change the time to 15:14."

What they say they want is a device that can receive a few numbers like the pagers, and one that can send a few like an HT. The notion of some sort of digital attachment for a small HT comes to mind. (My interpretation is that they prefer asynchronous (read and send at different times) rather than synchronous communication like a telephone which they feel is intrusive. With the pagers you can get a message and make a decision about when to respond.)

Does anyone have any suggestions?

Date: 13 Jan 94 03:07:55 GMT
From: ogicse!flop.ENG.RST.EDU!xanth.CS.ENG.RST.EDU!kayd@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Vacuum Tubes, Lots of them!
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

The Oregon State University Amateur Radio Club has a couple thousand vacuum tubes. These tubes vary from military/commercial, new/used, and in original boxes. We hope to sell the tubes in a lot to form an annuity for the club to use for future developments. I have a list made up that lists the tubes, quantity, quality, and which box they are in. If you are interested, send me mail with the subject "osutubes" for an automatically generated reply containing the inventory. Your message will not be received by me unless it has a different subject.

We only want to sell as a lot.

Darrek Kay
kayd@xanth.cs.orst.edu
(503)737-9410

Date: 12 Jan 1994 15:44:34 GMT
From: munnari.oz.au!spool.mu.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!darwin.sura.net!news-feed-2.peachnet.edu!concert!bigblue.oit.unc.edu!samba.oit.unc.edu!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Vintage 50's station for sale
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

For Sale:

TX- EF Johnson Viking Valiant II (Mint) 250 watts am/cw transmitter with full manuals and docs (even the warranty card)

RX- R390a Receiver (Very Good) recently retubed, realigned, lubed, painted with silkscreen and fully cleaned. The classic receiver with manuals

Acces: EF Johnson 250 watt Matchbox in fair condition. Was repainted but left decals

Millen 10 m preamp tubed in very good condition

Make me an offer I can't refuse or It will appear at Dayton in April...
de ab4vj terry

(919)544-5729 days/(919) 471-4018 after 2100 UTC
terry.murphy@launchpad.unc.edu

--

The opinions expressed are not necessarily those of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the Campus Office for Information Technology, or the Experimental Bulletin Board Service.
internet: laUNCHpad.unc.edu or 152.2.22.80

Date: 13 Jan 94 08:12:28 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!cs.utexas.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!airwaves!rrb@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: WANTED: 1930's Vacuum Tubes for display
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Hello! I'm looking for 1930s era water cooled vacuum tubes.
I'm, trying to help out a German friend's "world-class" tube collection.

Ideas? comments? Thoughts?
Drope me a line.

Thanks for any help
Rich Biby

Date: 12 Jan 1994 16:44:10 GMT
From: vtserf.cc.vt.edu!usenet@uunet.uu.net
Subject: WANTED: Info on Standard C5718DA
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Hi,

I'm interested in Standard's C5718DA dual-band mobile rig and would like to hear from anyone who has experience with it. I'm looking for a rig that I can mount under my car seat and operate from the mic so that I don't have to mount a control head on the dash.

Please e-mail if you have any knowledge of this rig.

Thanks, Benjy

--

Benjy Cline, AC4X0
Virginia Tech Computing Center
benjy@benjy.cc.vt.edu

Date: 12 Jan 1994 21:14:17 GMT
From: olivea!korie!newscast.West.Sun.COM!cronkite.Central.Sun.COM!webrider!
doc@uunet.uu.net
Subject: WANTED: Info on Standard C5718DA
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article gjp@vtserf.cc.vt.edu, benjy@benjy.cc.vt.edu (Ben E. Cline) writes:

> Hi,
>
> I'm interested in Standard's C5718DA dual-band mobile rig and
> would like to hear from anyone who has experience with it.
> I'm looking for a rig that I can mount under my car seat
> and operate from the mic so that I don't have to mount a
> control head on the dash.

I bought one of these about 4 weeks ago and I LIKE IT!!! I've been getting excellent signal reports, and have heard others using the Standard on the air with excellent sound quality.

One of the main reasons I bought this model is the microphone setup. I do exactly what you're planning on, I put the radio under the seat (I will eventually install it in the trunk) and use the microphone controls which are full featured. The Display on the microphone is very easy to read, the labels are backlit (are actually translucent so light from within the microphone shines thru them), and using the features becomes very easy after a short period of acclimation. How often do you run into a radio where a control head is an option? :^)

I have yet to run across any Intermod problems. In fact one of the

reasons I first looked at the Standard was from hearing that they were much less susceptible than most other brands (something to do with them using a different IF). The only Intermod I've heard since I bought this radio has come over the airwaves from someone else.

This model comes packet (9600 baud) ready, but I really can't say anything about that as I don't do packet yet. It has a wide range of scanning capability (100MHz-199.99MHz including AM capability, 250MHz-499.99MHz, and 800MHz-999.99MHz)

So far I, and another user, have only run into two issues that we consider problems. The biggest one is that, at present, when using crossband repeat mode the output won't include a PL tone. The other is that there seems to be no direct way to pull a frequency in memory into VFO mode (Scanners often do this with one or two keystrokes). You instead have to enter the freq. manually (no big deal). We have talked with Standard about these, and Standard is apparently going to have a fix for the PL problem sometime in February (for free of course :). I'm not sure about the Memory->VFO issue yet.

Overall, I'm extremely pleased with the radio. It ain't cheap but works real fine.

73,

--

-- Steve Bunis, Sun Microsystems ***DoD #0795*** 93-ST1100
-- Itasca, IL ***AMA #682049***
-- ***HRCA #HMM125617**
-- *** N9VLP ***

Date: Wed, 12 Jan 94 15:39:11 GMT

From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!uwm.edu!rpi!newsserver.pixel.kodak.com!kodak!
ornitz@network.ucsd.edu

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2d31e75a-5415rec.radio.amateur.misc@vpnet.chi.il.us>,
<CJHEC5.CJK@srngenprp.sr.hp.com>, <2gv1l8\$4jrn@ep130.wg2.waii.com>
Subject : Re: Fm Broadcast (Legal Part 15 power levels)

In article <2gv1l8\$4jrn@ep130.wg2.waii.com> mjpg@ep130.wg2.waii.com
(Michael Gentle) writes:

>Al you are correct, I did not mention low power. IF you use less then 100mw and
>a antenna for less then 5' in length then I beleive that it is legal. I thought
>that a higher power was implied though.

You would think that amateur radio operators would know the rules better than this. Part 15 of the FCC R&R's governs unlicensed transmitters.

Fellow hams...

PLEASE stop propagating these myths.

The Part 15 rules give the maximum permissible field strength at a specified distance from the antenna. For transmissions in the FM broadcast band, the numbers are 250 microvolts per meter measured at three meters. Note that this is a near-field measurement. For a ground-plane antenna, the necessary power to achieve this field strength is approximately 3 NANOWATTS. For a dipole antenna, 6 NANOWATTS will be the maximum permitted power.

Many commercial wireless microphones and FM home-broadcaster kits far exceed these power levels and are illegal to use by FCC rules.

73, Barry WA4VZQ

```
-----
|  _ _ _  _ _ _ _ _ _ _ |   Dr. Barry L. Ornitz           WA4VZQ
| | / /  _ _ _ _ _ _ _ |   Eastman Chemical Company
| | / /  _ _ _ _ _ _ _ |   ECC Research Laboratories, Engineering Research Div.
| |< < K O D A K |   Process Instrumentation Research Laboratory
| | \ \  _ _ _ _ _ _ _ |   P. O. Box 1972, Building 167B
| | _ \  _ _ _ _ _ _ _ |   Kingsport, TN 37662 (615/229-4904, FAX 615/229-4558)
| | _ _  _ _ _ _ _ _ _ |   INTERNET:  ornitz@kodak.com
| | _ _  _ _ _ _ _ _ _ |
| | _ _  _ _ _ _ _ _ _ |
-----
```

Eastman Chemical is no longer a part of Kodak. Until we get our own Internet connection Kodak has been gracious to continue to let us use hers.

Date: Wed, 12 Jan 94 16:21:36 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx10!jmaynard@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1994Jan05.065815.24300@wattres.sj.ca.us>,
<1994Jan5.125300.21517@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>, <2guq97\$mids@inxs.concert.net>
Subject : Re: Repeater database?

In article <2guq97\$mids@inxs.concert.net>,
W. M Wood -- The Signal Group <mikewood@rock.concert.net> wrote:
>>The reason for this is simple: if we didn't keep it
>>confidential, we wouldn't get the data either.
>More BS....

Ask Brian Kantor about that.

...or, for that matter, the majority of repeater trustees.

> The REAL reason this information isn't given out is that
>Cordination Groups want to wield their coordination POWER without
>fear of any questioning their declarations. With all the data on
>a repeater (lat/lon/haat/erp , etc) you could challenge or even
>ignore their refusal to coordinate a repeater on a frequency you
>have chosen.

This sounds like the ravings of someone who had a coordination denied, or who wants to start a repeater war and not have the FCC come explain the situation to him. You obviously have not been on the other side of the table.

> I suspect less than 1% of the so called coordinated
>repeaters in operation today have any sort of REAL engineering
>study including contour maps done on them. Most have been 'coordinated
>' by either first come first served ---- or Good Ole Boys Network
>methods.

First come first served is the only way that coordinators can operate and not get their collective butts sued off. Don't believe me? I've been there, again, and so have others. As for the kind of real engineering studies you advocate, do you know how much time and effort goes into producing a contour map? Multiply that by a thousand repeaters in Texas. It's prohibitive. We coordinate repeaters based on 85-mile separation, and will waive that if the trustee of the existing system will agree in writing.

>This information is publicly available for EVERY commercial radio
> and television station in the USA and there is absolutely no reason other
>than small minded POWERMONGERING politics that this isn't available
>for amateur repeaters.

How about time and money? Are you volunteering to run all those contour studies, or pay to have them done?

>I dare ANY so called coordinating group to prove me wrong by PUBLISHING
>there engineering studies for all their "coordinated" repeaters.

They don't exist to the degree you want, nor are they ever likely to in the amateur service.

>All we'll probably hear is either silence or a crescendo of flames
>about how their "integrity " has been insulted....but the engineering
>studies generally don't exist so we will never see them!

No flames about integrity here; just cold, hard reality. Then again, you sound like you've been hit by reality before, and didn't like it.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can

jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.
"A good flame is fuel to warm the soul." -- Karl Denninger

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #32
